



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 1, 2004

Ms. Charlotte L. Staples  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2004-10158

Dear Ms. Staples:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 214066.

The City of Granbury (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the city manager's personnel file, a named individual's letter of resignation, and a list of city employees reprimanded since July 13, 2004, to include the reason for the reprimand. You indicate that the city is providing some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim, however, that the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. The submitted personnel

---

<sup>1</sup> You raise section 552.022 of the Government Code for information that you contend is confidential by law. Section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), but rather provides a list of eighteen categories of information that are expressly public and may not be withheld unless confidential under other law. See Gov't Code § 552.301(a) (noting that exceptions to disclosure under Act are found at subchapter C of chapter 552 of Government Code). Thus, section 552.022 itself does not provide a basis for withholding information from disclosure. Section 552.101 of the Government Code is the exception to disclosure that encompasses information made confidential by law. See Gov't Code § 552.101. This office will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

records include W-4 forms. Prior decisions of this office have held that section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Tax return information is defined as data furnished to or collected by the IRS with respect to the determination of possible existence of liability of any person under title 26 of the United States Code for any tax. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b). We determine that the submitted W-4 forms are tax return information and are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by federal law.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683. Prior decisions of this office have determined that personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally not subject to a legitimate public interest and is therefore protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, this office has also determined that the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body generally are subject to a legitimate public interest. *See* Open Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy), 523 (1989). Whether financial information is subject to a legitimate public interest and therefore not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). We have marked the information in the submitted documents that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.<sup>2</sup>

You have marked a document in the submitted information that you seek to withhold under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information protected by the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the

---

<sup>2</sup> Based on this finding, we do not reach your claim under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body.<sup>3</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives.<sup>4</sup> TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body seeking to establish that a communication is protected by the attorney-client privilege must inform this office of the identity and capacity of each individual involved in the communication. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a communication that is confidential. *Id.* 503(b)(1). A confidential communication is a communication that was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). You indicate that the information you seek to withhold under section 552.107 is a communication to the city from an attorney for the city made in the course of providing legal services to the city. You also indicate that the communication was intended to be confidential, and that the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that the city may withhold this information, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.107(1) as information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

---

<sup>3</sup> The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is acting in a capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element.

<sup>4</sup> Specifically, the privilege applies only to confidential communications between the client or a representative of the client and the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer; between the lawyer and the lawyer’s representative; by the client or a representative of the client, or the client’s lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein; between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E); *see also id.* 503(a)(2), (a)(4) (defining “representative of the client,” “representative of the lawyer”).

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the city may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who elected to keep information confidential pursuant to section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. You state, and provide documentation showing, that the employees at issue timely elected to keep confidential the personal information at issue in the submitted documents. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the city must withhold the marked information pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. We also note, however, that the submitted personnel records contain the social security number of another city employee, which we have marked. If the city determines this individual timely elected to keep his social security number confidential, the city must withhold it under section 552.117(a)(1).

In the event, however, the additional city employee at issue did not timely elect to keep his social security number confidential, we note that the social security number may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. A social security number may be excepted from disclosure in some circumstances under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I) of title 42 of the United States Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number at issue is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Government Code imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, you have also marked information in the submitted documents that the city seeks to withhold under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130. We agree the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle driver's license and registration information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, W-4 forms must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with federal law. We have marked personal financial information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. We have marked an attorney-client communication that may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code as information protected by the attorney-client privilege. The city must withhold the marked information in the remaining submitted documents pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. In the event a city employee whose social security number appears in the submitted records did not timely elect to keep the social security number confidential, it may be excepted under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law. The marked Texas motor vehicle driver's license and registration information must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor

should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 214066

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tereasa Nims  
3211 Bowie  
Granbury, Texas 76049  
(w/o enclosures)